Water Quality Working Group



Meeting Minutes

Date: 10/27/11

Start Time: 12:00 pm End Time: 2:30 pm

Meeting Method: Go-To-Meeting/Conference Call at island-specific sanctuary offices

Meeting Objective: Discuss recommendations for full sanctuary advisory council review

Attendance: Leader Robin Newbold (Chair), Fiona Langenberger, Gordon LaBedz, Suzanne Shriner, Chris Ostrander, Malia Chow, Makaala Kaaumoana, Larry Stevens, Doug Cole, Carol Wilcox, Robin Knox, Allen Tom, Mary Jorgensen, Maile Carpio, Jay Carpio, Joseph Paulin, Brenda Asuncion, Sarah Corbis, Jean Souza,

Public:

David Penn, Nina Monasevitch

Agenda

I Role (see above)

II Review draft recommendations report and discussion

The Working Group discussed in detail the draft recommendations (last updated 10/26). Below is a summary of the discussion, sorted by the different sections of the draft document.

Draft Document Section: "Need for Action"

- The term "previous authorization" in the first paragraph needs to be clarified. Staff will send the original language from the Act to participants. They can then decide whether the original language should be included in the paragraph itself, a footnote, or not at all.
- 3rd paragraph Include "such as sediments, nutrients..."
- 4th paragraph: "quantity of sediment, level of species and habitats diversity" might need some rewording to be more specific; it is too vague from a biological standpoint. Carol will rewrite this (Robin K. will send matrix to Carol)

Draft Document Section "Desired Outcome"

- Robin K submitted comments via email Gordon agrees with all of Robin's comments
- "More fully incorporates the Native Hawaiian Culture" reword to "Continue to incorporate"
- "Native Hawaiian Culture" refers in this context to the ahupua'a idea using that knowledge that comes from the past. Maka'ala will make edits to last sentence.

Water Quality Working Group



Meeting Minutes

Draft Document Section "Recommendations"

 There are currently about 25 recommendations, would be good to reduce the number and combine some of the recommendations

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Water Quality Monitoring

- Number 3: Carol has a detailed draft for this specific paragraph. Carol will send her draft to Robin K. and both of them will develop a new version.
- General question: How specific should the recommendations be? The more information the
 better, but the group should not get lost in the specifics. It needs to be clear what the
 working group intends to say in each of the recommendation. One suggestion was to have
 main recommendations and have sub-recommendations that are more specific. Or make
 recommendations reasonably general and add specificity in footnote
- · Monitoring should not only focus on "marine" issues but the entire watershed

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Collaborations

- Number 1: watershed management instead of interconnectedness
- Number 2: include "sediment" earlier in sentence
- Number 3: sanctuary should have a more formal stakeholder status, sanctuary might differ from other marine agencies. Maka'ala will make some minor changes to this paragraph
- Number 4: "Traditional ecological knowledge" Maka'ala will check on better language for this particular term
- Number 4: An interagency initiative is needed to bring together county, state and other parties. Sanctuary might be the right "convener". Focus on watersheds within the sanctuary (not the entire state)

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" – Commenting on Activities that could affect marine resources

- Number 1: include "underground injection control (UIC) permits" after NPDES
- Number 2: "Aha Moku, Aha Kiole" there are also other recognized groups, entities, in certain areas to collaborate with. Members of the groups agreed not to list specific entities. Replace with "Local community based management groups"

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Point and non-point sources of pollution

- Within the topic description delete "marine" in debris
- In general for threats you might want to list the source of information or cite where the information is coming from
- Number 3: "genetically modified organisms" are organisms not pollutants, but may or may not have an impact on the environment, would have to look case-by-case.
- Number 3 as a whole might be overreaching seems unrealistic, premature to put prohibition in here. Sanctuary needs to be involved upfront to prevent things from happening. Working with local government and local community groups to limit such pollutants in sanctuary waters. Consider deleting this paragraph.

Water Quality Working Group



Meeting Minutes

- Number 1: Currently there are not good monitoring programs within sanctuary in place. Rephrase to "Identify, establish, and support" monitor programs" because some places don't have biological monitoring programs in place.
- Combine Number 4 with Number 1 from Outreach Recommendation
- Combine Number 2 and Number 5 they both relate to reducing erosion and sediment flow.
- Number 4: Emphasize to make good community choices, collectively. Change to: "that people and communities"

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Outreach and Education

- Number 4 (from previous recommendation): Move into O&E section.
- Footnote 17: Jay will send some additional language

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Ecosystem based sanctuary

• Move up to list this as the very first recommendation of the document. This will set the tone for the rest of the document.

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Vessel Discharge

- · Combine number 1 and 2.
- Combine number 3 and 4

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Offshore Development

Number 3 delete first sentence and combine 2 and 3

Draft Document Section "Recommendations" - Precautionary Principle

- List before Offshore Development and Vessel Discharge recommendation
- Number 2 is overstated delete. The SAC should define what Precautionary Principle exactly means.

III Discuss next steps - voting and finalizing the draft recommendations report

- Robin Knox will go through recommendations that were suggested by Native Hawaiian Working Group and the Humpback Whale Protections Working Group
- For those working group members that volunteered to rewrite certain sections, please make changes by tomorrow
- There will be another Go-To-Meeting to discuss the final changes to the report on Wed. Nov. 2nd at 12:00pm.
- The final recommendation document will be sent to all working group members to vote on every recommendation (as: support, not support, neutral). This will be included in the report that goes to the SAC.

IV Public Comment

Dave Penn from University of Hawaii Environmental Center:

 Might want to consider to rename traditional ecological knowledge to "traditional environmental knowledge"

Sanctuary Advisory Council

Water Quality Working Group

Meeting Minutes

- He supports the idea to have the sanctuary be the convener of various agencies and to become an active stakeholder
- With regard to the types of prohibition that could be implemented and whether necessary sanctuary could make directory of existing authority available to SAC
- Vessel discharge and dumping give more explanation of current legal situation and what it could be in the future.
- Department of Health needs to clarify the classification of sanctuary waters and if all waters are "class AA marine waters". This affects the types of protection, what is prohibited, what level of treatments required for those discharges that are allowed etc.
 - Robin Knox will think about how to include in recommendations, could be included in desired outcome section.

No Public Comments on Kauai, Maui and Hawaii.

V Pau

Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 2, 2011 at noon.

For additional information contact Joseph Paulin at 808-397-2651 x 257 or joseph.paulin@noaa.gov